

Appendix C. Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the

sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than \$25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1992 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures. These estimation procedures accounted for nonresponse to the data collection and for the sample data collection. These procedures are necessary because some farm operators never respond to

the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and the estimates for the sample data are based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited "rare" commodities were designated as "ineligible" to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided

in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992

Item	Percent of total
Farmsnumber. .	15.4
Land in farms.....acres. .	9.8
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹\$1,000. .	4.0
Market value of agricultural products sold ..\$1,000. .	4.3
Harvested croplandacres. .	8.0
Corn for grain or seedacres. .	6.8
Wheat for grainacres. .	7.9
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber. .	9.4
Hogs and pigsnumber. .	5.9
Hens and pullets of laying age.....number. .	2.5

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimates the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. The estimates were obtained from a ratio estimation procedure that resulted in the assignment of a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records in the county.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm would be multiplied by 6. The weight assigned to a sample certainty farm was 1.

Other than certainty farms, within a county, the ratio estimation procedure for farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1992 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. Both the second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were as follows:

TVP	SIC	Acres
\$1 to \$999	01 All crops	1 to 69
\$1,000 to \$2,499	02 All livestock	70 or more
\$2,500 to \$4,999		
\$5,000 to \$9,999		
\$10,000 to \$24,999		
\$25,000 to \$49,999		
\$50,000 to \$99,999		
\$100,000 or more		

The first step in the estimation procedure was to classify the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial post strata formed by the three sets of groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample weight equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This weight was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure was to combine, if necessary, the 32 initial post strata to increase the reliability of the ratio estimation procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms after nonresponse adjustment or had a weight greater than two times the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2 or 6, depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2 or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the initial 32 post strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each of the final post strata and were used to calculate final sample weights.

The final step consisted of assigning the noninteger final post stratum weight to the sample farm records in each post stratum. The weight is the ratio of total farm count to sample farm count in each final post stratum. The noninteger sample weight, the product of the noninteger final post stratum weight and the nonresponse weight, was randomly rounded to an integer weight for tabulation. If, for example, the final weight for the farms in a particular post stratum was 7.2, then 0.2 or one-fifth of the sample farms in this post stratum were randomly assigned a weight of 8 and the remaining four-fifths received a weight of 7.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. Complete count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Sample count items were asked only of a sample of farm operators. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Variability, measured as percent relative standard error, in the estimates of complete count items is due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. Variability in the estimates of sample count items is due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Thus, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard error for estimated number of farms in a county reporting a complete count item and the bottom half a sample count item. These are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used for complete count items and sample count items. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State. For sample count items, only data

from counties sampled at a rate of 1 in 6 are used in the estimation of the regression equation.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.9
50	4.1
75	3.2
100	2.7
150	2.0
200	1.6
300	1.0
5008
7506
1,0005
1,5004
2,000	(X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	36.0
50	25.6
75	21.1
100	18.4
150	15.2
200	13.4
300	11.2
500	9.1
750	7.8
1,000	7.1
1,500	6.3
2,000	(X)

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1987 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count item estimates comes only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures; thus, the estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of \$10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general

purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies will be conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used

by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS will be protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list

coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of

completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.
- Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met.

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms ----- number --	13 037	1.1	Total farm production expenses ----- farms --	13 040	1.0
Land in farms ----- acres --	2 223 476	.7	----- \$1,000 --	974 511	.6
Average size of farm ----- acres --	171	1.3	Average per farm ----- dollars --	74 732	1.2
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms --		
Total sales (see text) ----- farms --	13 037	1.1	----- \$1,000 --	126 429	1.4
----- \$1,000 --	1 169 331	.4	Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms --	6 929	1.9
Average per farm ----- dollars --	89 693	1.1	----- \$1,000 --	299 426	.7
Farms by value of sales:			Commercially mixed formula feeds ----- farms --	4 111	2.6
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ----- farms --	1 691	1.8	----- \$1,000 --	267 690	.8
----- \$1,000 --	404	2.1	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms --	8 052	1.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ----- farms --	1 474	1.7	----- \$1,000 --	29 339	1.5
----- \$1,000 --	2 487	1.7	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms --	9 078	1.5
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ----- farms --	1 642	1.6	----- \$1,000 --	59 352	2.2
----- \$1,000 --	5 921	1.6	Agricultural chemicals ----- farms --	8 999	1.6
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ----- farms --	1 698	1.5	----- \$1,000 --	34 930	2.1
----- \$1,000 --	11 954	1.5	Petroleum products ----- farms --	12 224	1.1
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms --	1 417	1.5	----- \$1,000 --	33 278	1.3
----- \$1,000 --	20 135	1.6	Electricity ----- farms --	9 068	1.6
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms --	405	2.1	----- \$1,000 --	18 192	1.0
----- \$1,000 --	9 009	2.1	Hired farm labor ----- farms --	4 875	2.5
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms --	743	1.8	----- \$1,000 --	93 631	1.2
----- \$1,000 --	23 081	1.8	Contract labor ----- farms --	1 335	5.7
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms --	353	2.2	----- \$1,000 --	7 688	4.6
----- \$1,000 --	15 854	2.2	Repair and maintenance ----- farms --	11 052	1.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms --	904	1.7	----- \$1,000 --	55 156	1.7
----- \$1,000 --	65 610	1.7	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms --	4 733	2.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms --	1 436	1.2	----- \$1,000 --	13 471	4.3
----- \$1,000 --	232 332	1.1	Interest expense ----- farms --	4 602	2.6
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms --	793	—	----- \$1,000 --	42 938	2.0
----- \$1,000 --	275 057	—	Secured by real estate ----- farms --	3 148	3.2
\$500,000 or more ----- farms --	481	—	----- \$1,000 --	30 743	2.4
----- \$1,000 --	507 487	—	Not secured by real estate ----- farms --	2 515	3.7
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			----- \$1,000 --	12 195	3.7
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms --	8 420	1.1	Cash rent ----- farms --	3 632	2.9
----- \$1,000 --	388 143	.5	----- \$1,000 --	36 065	2.9
Grains ----- farms --	5 441	1.1	Property taxes ----- farms --	11 734	1.2
----- \$1,000 --	218 739	.6	----- \$1,000 --	20 879	1.8
Corn for grain ----- farms --	3 450	1.1	All other farm production expenses ----- farms --	11 904	1.2
----- \$1,000 --	95 364	.6	----- \$1,000 --	103 737	.9
Wheat ----- farms --	2 709	1.1	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) ¹		
----- \$1,000 --	30 669	.7	All farms ----- number --	13 040	1.0
Soybeans ----- farms --	3 619	1.1	----- \$1,000 --	186 174	2.2
----- \$1,000 --	84 010	.6	Average per farm ----- dollars --	14 277	2.5
Sorghum for grain ----- farms --	197	1.9	Farms with net gains ² ----- number --	6 768	1.8
----- \$1,000 --	1 548	1.9	----- \$1,000 --	235 530	1.5
Barley ----- farms --	885	1.2	Average net gain ----- dollars --	34 800	2.4
----- \$1,000 --	6 239	.9	Farms with net losses ----- number --	6 272	2.0
Oats ----- farms --	200	2.3	----- \$1,000 --	49 355	3.3
----- \$1,000 --	220	2.7	Average net loss ----- dollars --	7 869	3.9
Other grains ----- farms --	182	2.0	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
----- \$1,000 --	688	1.5	Government payments ----- farms --	1 733	1.1
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms --	—	—	----- \$1,000 --	10 960	.6
----- \$1,000 --	—	—	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms --	3 541	3.4
Tobacco ----- farms --	950	1.6	----- \$1,000 --	20 319	6.1
----- \$1,000 --	17 286	1.7	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms --	1 243	6.2
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms --	2 329	1.3	----- \$1,000 --	9 777	9.7
----- \$1,000 --	12 963	1.5	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms --	1 425	5.8
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms --	1 164	1.4	----- \$1,000 --	4 814	8.3
----- \$1,000 --	37 752	.6	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms --	530	9.3
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms --	432	1.8	----- \$1,000 --	3 348	14.4
----- \$1,000 --	10 357	1.4	Other farm-related income sources ----- farms --	1 132	6.0
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms --	781	1.2	----- \$1,000 --	2 381	12.3
----- \$1,000 --	88 610	.3	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Other crops ----- farms --	162	2.6	Total ----- farms --	241	1.6
----- \$1,000 --	2 436	3.3	----- \$1,000 --	9 508	.7
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms --	7 119	1.0			
----- \$1,000 --	781 188	.3			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms --	1 625	.9			
----- \$1,000 --	494 441	.2			
Dairy products ----- farms --	1 188	1.1			
----- \$1,000 --	191 033	.6			
Cattle and calves ----- farms --	4 545	1.1			
----- \$1,000 --	53 985	.9			
Hogs and pigs ----- farms --	843	1.4			
----- \$1,000 --	23 283	.9			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms --	571	1.7			
----- \$1,000 --	1 045	2.1			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms --	1 111	1.6			
----- \$1,000 --	17 401	1.0			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms --	1 268	1.4			
----- \$1,000 --	7 424	1.2			

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-7

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_958 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 3/21/94 10:03 AM MACHINE: EPCV20 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_52,TIPS:1 * 3/16/94 10:20:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 1
TSF:TIPS92-10201396.DAT;1 3/16/94 10:20:21 UTF:TIPS93-10201396.DAT;1 3/16/94 10:20:22 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_52.DAT;2 3/16/94 10:21:04

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK—Con.		
1 to 9 acres ----- farms --	1 560	1.4	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms --	4 545	1.1
----- acres --	7 215	1.5	----- number..	133 633	.8
10 to 49 acres ----- farms --	3 979	1.4	----- \$1,000..	53 985	.9
----- acres --	100 453	1.4	Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms --	910	1.4
50 to 69 acres ----- farms --	1 115	1.5	----- number..	145 519	.9
----- acres --	64 567	1.5	Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms --	843	1.4
70 to 99 acres ----- farms --	1 131	1.5	----- number..	289 149	1.1
----- acres --	93 793	1.5	----- \$1,000..	23 283	.9
100 to 139 acres ----- farms --	1 194	1.5	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms --	611	1.7
----- acres --	138 609	1.5	----- number..	25 291	1.6
140 to 179 acres ----- farms --	814	1.6	Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms --	525	1.8
----- acres --	127 759	1.6	----- number..	16 654	2.0
180 to 219 acres ----- farms --	610	1.7	Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms --	2 763	1.4
----- acres --	120 358	1.7	----- number..	24 326	1.6
220 to 259 acres ----- farms --	458	1.8	Horses and ponies sold ----- farms --	761	1.8
----- acres --	108 802	1.8	----- number..	2 495	2.2
260 to 499 acres ----- farms --	1 184	1.3	POULTRY		
----- acres --	420 737	1.2	Chickens 3 months old or older inventory ----- farms --	839	1.6
500 to 999 acres ----- farms --	641	1.1	----- number..	4 268 626	.7
----- acres --	435 358	1.0	Hens and pullets of laying age ----- farms --	827	1.6
1,000 to 1,999 acres ----- farms --	266	—	----- number..	3 828 633	.5
----- acres --	353 726	—	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ----- farms --	1 109	.8
2,000 acres or more ----- farms --	85	—	----- number..	257 209 663	.3
----- acres --	252 099	—	CROPS HARVESTED		
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			Corn for grain or seed ----- farms --	4 631	1.1
Cash grains (011) ----- farms --	2 933	1.2	----- acres..	454 083	.6
----- acres --	995 734	.8	----- bushels..	52 596 358	.6
Field crops, except cash grains (013) ----- farms --	1 722	1.5	Corn for silage or green chop ----- farms --	1 567	1.2
----- acres --	146 271	1.5	----- acres..	73 023	.8
Vegetables and melons (016) ----- farms --	577	1.7	----- tons, green..	1 175 894	.8
----- acres --	63 800	1.2	Wheat for grain ----- farms --	2 774	1.1
Fruits and tree nuts (017) ----- farms --	293	2.3	----- acres..	188 122	.7
----- acres --	17 940	2.3	----- bushels..	10 233 795	.7
Horticultural specialties (018) ----- farms --	611	1.2	Barley for grain ----- farms --	1 291	1.1
----- acres --	31 500	1.3	----- acres..	63 024	.8
General farms, primarily crop (019) ----- farms --	454	1.9	----- bushels..	4 240 170	.8
----- acres --	79 917	1.7	Oats for grain ----- farms --	659	1.5
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) ----- farms --	2 918	1.3	----- acres..	8 276	1.7
----- acres --	309 784	1.2	----- bushels..	506 407	1.7
Dairy farms (024) ----- farms --	1 074	1.2	Tobacco ----- farms --	951	1.6
----- acres --	351 949	.8	----- acres..	8 470	1.7
Poultry and eggs (025) ----- farms --	1 200	.8	----- pounds..	11 794 382	1.7
----- acres --	146 294	.4	Soybeans for beans ----- farms --	3 663	1.1
Animal specialties (027) ----- farms --	1 150	1.8	----- acres..	503 181	.6
----- acres --	58 137	1.8	----- bushels..	16 226 822	.6
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) ----- farms --	105	3.0	Irish potatoes ----- farms --	169	2.6
----- acres --	22 150	2.3	----- acres..	1 679	2.3
LIVESTOCK			----- cwt..	318 173	3.1
Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms --	4 978	1.1	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ----- farms --	5 532	1.1
----- number..	283 167	.8	----- acres..	222 184	1.0
Beef cows ----- farms --	2 921	1.2	----- tons, dry..	545 526	.9
----- number..	51 676	1.2	Alfalfa hay ----- farms --	2 795	1.1
Milk cows ----- farms --	1 329	1.1	----- acres..	79 611	1.0
----- number..	94 751	.7	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ----- farms --	246 657	1.0
			----- acres..	1 167	1.4
			Land in orchards ----- farms --	36 313	.9
			----- acres..	517	1.9
				5 798	1.8

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms ----- number ..	6 532	1.0	Total farm production expenses ----- farms ..	6 575	1.2
Land in farms ----- acres ..	1 843 076	.7	----- \$1,000 ..	930 916	.6
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	282	1.2	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	141 584	1.3
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms ..	2 808	2.8
Total sales (see text) ----- farms ..	6 532	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	123 513	1.4
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	1 148 566	.4	Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms ..	3 800	2.1
Farms by value of sales:			----- \$1,000 ..	294 746	.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms ..	1 417	1.5	Commercially mixed formula feeds ----- farms ..	2 804	2.6
----- \$1,000 ..	20 135	1.6	----- \$1,000 ..	266 283	.8
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms ..	405	2.1	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms ..	5 084	1.7
----- \$1,000 ..	9 009	2.1	----- \$1,000 ..	28 335	1.6
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms ..	743	1.8	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	5 267	1.5
----- \$1,000 ..	23 081	1.8	----- \$1,000 ..	56 578	2.2
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms ..	353	2.2	Agricultural chemicals ----- farms ..	5 352	1.6
----- \$1,000 ..	15 854	2.2	----- \$1,000 ..	33 627	2.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms ..	904	1.7	Petroleum products ----- farms ..	6 362	1.2
----- \$1,000 ..	65 610	1.7	----- \$1,000 ..	30 345	1.3
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms ..	1 436	1.2	Electricity ----- farms ..	5 479	1.7
----- \$1,000 ..	232 332	1.1	----- \$1,000 ..	16 949	1.0
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms ..	793	—	Hired farm labor ----- farms ..	3 440	2.5
----- \$1,000 ..	275 057	—	----- \$1,000 ..	91 817	1.2
\$500,000 or more ----- farms ..	481	—	Contract labor ----- farms ..	840	6.3
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			----- \$1,000 ..	7 268	4.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	5 008	1.1	Repair and maintenance ----- farms ..	6 115	1.3
----- \$1,000 ..	376 370	.5	----- \$1,000 ..	48 662	1.8
Grains ----- farms ..	3 902	1.1	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	3 163	3.0
----- \$1,000 ..	213 864	.6	----- \$1,000 ..	12 362	4.6
Corn for grain ----- farms ..	2 690	1.1	Interest expense ----- farms ..	3 422	2.6
----- \$1,000 ..	93 491	.6	----- \$1,000 ..	38 869	2.0
Wheat ----- farms ..	2 319	1.1	Secured by real estate ----- farms ..	2 294	3.3
----- \$1,000 ..	30 047	.7	----- \$1,000 ..	27 114	2.4
Soybeans ----- farms ..	2 862	1.1	Not secured by real estate ----- farms ..	2 081	3.8
----- \$1,000 ..	81 830	.6	----- \$1,000 ..	11 755	3.8
Sorghum for grain ----- farms ..	181	1.9	Cash rent ----- farms ..	2 901	2.9
----- \$1,000 ..	1 515	1.9	----- \$1,000 ..	35 471	2.9
Barley ----- farms ..	791	1.2	Property taxes ----- farms ..	5 740	1.5
----- \$1,000 ..	6 128	.9	----- \$1,000 ..	13 176	2.0
Oats ----- farms ..	136	2.7	All other farm production expenses ----- farms ..	6 564	1.2
----- \$1,000 ..	184	3.0	----- \$1,000 ..	99 198	.9
Other grains ----- farms ..	157	2.0	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
----- \$1,000 ..	670	1.5	All farms ----- number ..	6 575	1.2
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms ..	—	—	----- \$1,000 ..	209 294	1.9
----- \$1,000 ..	—	—	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	31 832	2.3
Tobacco ----- farms ..	580	1.8	Farms with net gains ² ----- number ..	5 119	1.8
----- \$1,000 ..	15 498	1.8	----- \$1,000 ..	232 465	1.5
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms ..	1 108	1.5	Average net gain ----- dollars ..	45 412	2.4
----- \$1,000 ..	10 128	1.7	Farms with net losses ----- number ..	1 456	5.2
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms ..	710	1.4	----- \$1,000 ..	23 170	5.3
----- \$1,000 ..	36 727	.6	Average net loss ----- dollars ..	15 914	7.4
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms ..	203	2.1	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
----- \$1,000 ..	9 971	1.5	Government payments ----- farms ..	1 366	1.1
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	520	1.2	----- \$1,000 ..	10 426	.6
----- \$1,000 ..	87 804	.3	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms ..	2 049	4.1
Other crops ----- farms ..	92	3.0	----- \$1,000 ..	15 411	7.4
----- \$1,000 ..	2 377	3.4	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms ..	944	6.9
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms ..	4 056	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	8 801	10.6
----- \$1,000 ..	772 196	.3	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms ..	609	8.5
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms ..	1 354	.8	----- \$1,000 ..	2 885	11.3
----- \$1,000 ..	494 277	.2	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms ..	267	12.8
Dairy products ----- farms ..	1 164	1.1	----- \$1,000 ..	2 030	17.1
----- \$1,000 ..	190 982	.6	Other farm-related income sources ----- farms ..	805	6.6
Cattle and calves ----- farms ..	2 499	1.1	----- \$1,000 ..	1 695	12.2
----- \$1,000 ..	47 871	.9	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Hogs and pigs ----- farms ..	576	1.6	Total ----- farms ..	228	1.6
----- \$1,000 ..	22 761	.9	----- \$1,000 ..	9 488	.7
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms ..	181	2.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	559	2.8			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms ..	359	2.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	15 746	1.1			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms ..	571	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	6 386	1.3			

See footnotes at end of table.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

See footnotes at end of table.

Table D. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More:
1992—Con.**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory -----farms --	342	2.0	Barley for grain -----farms --	1 144	1.1
-----number--	4 254 864	.7	-----acres--	61 384	.8
Hens and pullets of laying age -----farms --	335	2.0	-----bushels--	4 156 389	.8
-----number--	3 816 052	.5	Oats for grain -----farms --	460	1.7
-----number--			-----acres--	6 974	1.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold -----farms --	1 088	.8	-----bushels--	431 566	1.9
-----number--	257 201 910	.3	-----farms --	581	1.8
			-----acres--	71 866	1.8
			-----pounds--	10 393 300	1.9
			Soybeans for beans -----farms --	2 881	1.1
			-----acres--	485 858	.6
			-----bushels--	15 779 882	.6
			Irish potatoes -----farms --	93	3.0
			-----acres--	1 621	2.3
			-----cwt--	310 379	3.2
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text) -----farms --	2 711	1.2
			-----acres--	163 863	1.0
			-----tons, dry--	446 829	1.0
			Alfalfa hay -----farms --	1 750	1.2
			-----acres--	63 969	1.1
			-----tons, dry--	212 861	1.0
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) -----farms --	712	1.4
			-----acres--	34 641	.9
			Land in orchards -----farms --	159	2.4
			-----acres--	4 831	2.1

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farms..... number..	-11.8	1.3	-3.7	1.2
Land in farms..... acres..	-7.2	.9	-2.1	.8
Average size of farm..... acres..	5.6	1.8	1.4	1.5
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm..... dollars..	37.4	3.8	27.7	3.9
Average per acre..... dollars..	28.7	4.0	25.6	4.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm..... dollars..	13.2	3.1	9.3	3.2
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres.....	-15.1	1.7	-8.5	1.5
10 to 49 acres.....	-9.6	1.8	2.8	1.7
50 to 179 acres.....	-12.9	1.4	1.1	1.7
180 to 499 acres.....	-13.1	1.3	-9.5	1.4
500 to 999 acres.....	-10.0	1.3	-6.9	1.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres.....	-6.3	-	-6.0	-
2,000 acres or more.....	28.8	-	32.8	-
Total cropland..... farms..	-12.1	1.3	-1.8	1.3
Harvested cropland..... acres..	-4.6	.8	-	.8
Irrigated land..... farms..	-12.7	1.3	-1.5	1.3
..... acres..	3.7	.8	8.5	.8
Market value of agricultural products sold..... \$1,000..	18.2	.5	19.1	.5
Average per farm..... dollars..	34.0	2.1	23.6	1.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops..... \$1,000..	53.4	.9	57.5	.9
Livestock, poultry, and their products..... \$1,000..	6.1	.4	6.4	.4
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500.....	-24.0	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	-15.7	1.9	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	-9.7	1.8	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	-9.4	1.8	-9.4	1.8
\$25,000 to \$49,999.....	-4	2.3	-4	2.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	-16.6	1.8	-16.6	1.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	-8.5	1.1	-8.5	1.1
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	7.6	-	7.6	-
\$500,000 or more.....	71.8	-	71.8	-
Total farm production expenses ¹ \$1,000..	14.5	1.4	16.0	1.5
Average per farm..... dollars..	29.7	2.1	19.6	1.9
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹ farms..	-11.7	1.3	-3.0	1.3
Average per farm..... \$1,000..	37.7	5.0	30.7	4.0
..... dollars..	56.0	6.1	34.7	4.5
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming.....	-11.4	1.1	-8.2	1.1
Other.....	-12.1	1.7	9.9	1.9
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any.....	-15.5	4.4	-2.8	5.0
200 days or more.....	-17.1	4.3	-5	5.2
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory..... farms..	-13.9	1.2	-11.1	1.2
Beef cows..... number..	-8.1	.8	-8.7	.8
Milk cows..... farms..	-8.3	1.6	1.7	1.8
..... number..	6.6	1.8	12.5	2.1
Cattle and calves sold..... farms..	-21.5	1.1	-16.8	1.1
..... number..	-14.2	.7	-13.9	.7
Hogs and pigs inventory..... farms..	-15.3	1.2	-11.3	1.2
Hogs and pigs sold..... number..	-13.5	.8	-13.0	.8
..... farms..	-31.2	1.3	-28.9	1.4
..... number..	-26.2	.9	-26.0	.9
..... farms..	-33.4	1.3	-28.7	1.4
..... number..	-22.4	1.0	-21.8	1.0
..... farms..	-7.4	2.3	-7.9	2.8
..... number..	2.8	2.6	1.5	3.0
..... farms..	-37.2	1.3	-32.5	1.7
..... number..	5.1	.8	5.9	.8
..... farms..	-19.7	.7	-19.6	.7
..... number..	.1	.3	.1	.3
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed..... farms..	-17.4	1.1	-3.2	1.3
..... acres..	5.0	.8	9.9	.8
..... bushels..	64.7	1.2	70.4	1.2
..... farms..	-10.9	1.2	.9	1.4
..... acres..	28.8	1.2	35.8	1.2
..... bushels..	51.2	1.3	58.0	1.3
..... farms..	-16.2	1.2	-12.8	1.2
..... acres..	6.3	1.0	8.4	1.0
..... bushels..	14.4	1.1	16.6	1.1
..... farms..	-29.9	1.5	-1.5	2.3
..... acres..	-21.4	1.8	-8.0	2.2
..... pounds..	-14.2	2.0	-2.5	2.4
..... farms..	-9	1.3	10.2	1.4
..... acres..	24.2	1.1	29.7	1.0
..... bushels..	73.5	1.4	79.3	1.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)..... farms..	-16.4	1.3	-11.0	1.3
..... acres..	-13.1	1.0	-12.2	1.0
..... tons, dry..	-8.1	1.0	-6.0	1.0
..... farms..	-1.4	1.8	6.1	2.0
..... acres..	-5.0	1.1	-4.3	1.1

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹			
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Maryland -----	13 037	1.1	2 223 476	.7	171	1.3	503 828	1.9	657 587	1.6		
Allegany -----	219	1.1	37 802	1.7	173	2.1	182 228	8.4	6 379	15.3		
Anne Arundel -----	477	1.2	43 320	2.0	91	2.3	339 486	11.3	12 764	11.8		
Baltimore -----	840	1.2	83 232	1.1	99	1.6	522 026	6.5	29 496	4.8		
Calvert -----	400	1.6	37 320	2.5	93	3.0	367 263	13.1	13 875	18.5		
Caroline -----	588	1.0	126 981	1.0	216	1.4	416 274	3.4	37 304	6.0		
Carroll -----	1 080	.9	157 505	.9	146	1.3	520 562	4.9	55 197	5.6		
Cecil -----	455	1.2	80 241	1.4	176	1.9	556 620	5.8	19 845	5.1		
Charles -----	496	1.8	59 389	2.0	120	2.7	380 124	10.0	13 361	9.0		
Dorchester -----	347	1.1	123 762	1.0	357	1.5	692 153	7.0	28 838	5.6		
Frederick -----	1 346	1.0	222 768	.8	166	1.3	578 279	4.2	69 291	3.5		
Garrett -----	634	1.1	110 699	1.4	175	1.8	194 104	5.7	21 992	8.7		
Harford -----	695	1.7	97 312	1.2	140	2.0	520 778	5.1	31 354	5.4		
Howard -----	382	1.2	44 623	1.5	117	1.9	492 252	5.7	14 237	8.0		
Kent -----	318	1.0	131 283	.9	413	1.4	1 068 149	5.7	34 637	6.6		
Montgomery -----	561	1.4	82 470	1.3	147	1.9	787 024	9.0	27 868	10.3		
Prince George's -----	551	1.9	54 459	1.4	99	2.4	383 650	7.7	17 401	7.6		
Queen Anne's -----	413	.9	165 349	.7	400	1.2	1 022 070	4.1	37 065	5.0		
St. Mary's -----	673	1.4	77 491	1.4	115	2.0	284 369	4.9	22 486	6.7		
Somerset -----	345	1.0	55 657	1.4	161	1.8	326 574	5.5	24 698	4.9		
Talbot -----	250	.9	109 108	1.0	436	1.3	1 464 667	9.1	29 949	10.9		
Washington -----	809	1.1	123 932	1.2	153	1.6	399 063	6.8	42 149	4.6		
Wicomico -----	684	.9	91 254	1.2	133	1.4	339 581	8.0	36 827	4.3		
Worcester -----	474	1.0	107 519	.9	227	1.3	418 862	4.9	30 573	2.5		
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹					
		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses					
							Farms		Value			
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Maryland -----	50 564	1.9	1 169 331	.4	89 693	1.1	13 040	1.0	974 511	.6		
Allegany -----	29 129	15.4	3 431	2.2	15 667	2.5	219	1.3	3 260	19.3		
Anne Arundel -----	26 703	11.9	11 234	1.5	23 552	1.9	478	1.3	7 380	5.3		
Baltimore -----	35 537	5.0	40 611	.7	48 347	1.4	840	1.3	35 511	2.5		
Calvert -----	34 688	18.6	6 795	3.0	16 987	3.4	400	2.1	7 020	20.0		
Caroline -----	63 550	6.1	85 053	.5	144 647	1.1	587	1.1	70 104	2.3		
Carroll -----	51 108	5.7	66 966	.6	62 005	1.1	1 080	.9	59 750	2.5		
Cecil -----	43 711	5.3	35 504	.7	78 031	1.4	454	1.5	30 752	1.6		
Charles -----	27 380	9.2	9 939	2.1	20 037	2.8	496	1.7	6 592	7.0		
Dorchester -----	83 346	5.7	64 089	.5	184 694	1.2	346	1.1	49 541	2.5		
Frederick -----	51 479	3.6	109 197	.6	81 127	1.2	1 346	1.0	92 234	1.6		
Garrett -----	34 742	8.8	20 437	1.7	32 235	2.0	633	1.3	15 968	4.2		
Harford -----	45 048	5.6	28 735	.9	41 345	1.9	696	1.8	25 983	4.7		
Howard -----	37 173	8.1	18 949	.7	49 605	1.4	383	1.1	15 819	2.6		
Kent -----	111 017	7.0	54 479	.5	171 317	1.2	319	1.3	47 777	1.3		
Montgomery -----	50 486	10.5	27 717	.6	49 407	1.5	562	1.4	25 157	3.8		
Prince George's -----	31 639	7.9	21 968	.6	39 869	2.0	550	2.1	14 764	2.2		
Queen Anne's -----	89 530	5.0	55 172	.5	133 589	1.0	414	.9	46 652	2.1		
St. Mary's -----	33 362	6.8	16 349	1.6	24 292	2.1	674	1.3	13 292	7.8		
Somerset -----	71 589	5.2	102 881	.4	298 206	1.1	345	1.5	86 408	.8		
Talbot -----	119 317	10.9	35 501	.6	142 004	1.1	251	1.0	31 325	5.7		
Washington -----	52 101	4.8	58 341	1.0	72 115	1.5	809	1.3	45 305	2.7		
Wicomico -----	53 840	4.4	164 682	.3	240 763	.9	684	1.1	138 824	.6		
Worcester -----	64 500	2.8	131 302	.4	277 009	1.1	474	1.4	105 093	1.1		
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	4 348	2.6	126 429	1.4	6 929	1.9	299 426	.7	8 052	1.7	29 339	1.5
Allegany -----	46	35.4	238	54.0	147	13.7	518	33.7	110	18.1	80	24.7
Anne Arundel -----	58	32.6	172	39.3	126	18.7	431	24.4	302	7.5	373	11.0
Baltimore -----	178	16.2	1 884	37.9	430	8.5	3 581	9.6	414	7.2	2 062	3.0
Calvert -----	53	31.1	333	83.7	131	16.6	160	21.9	240	8.5	305	31.4
Caroline -----	237	8.1	6 951	5.5	288	7.6	29 928	3.2	458	3.9	1 559	5.8
Carroll -----	450	7.6	5 458	7.9	706	4.2	14 996	4.2	704	4.2	2 630	4.3
Cecil -----	109	18.4	1 831	8.2	194	12.5	8 560	2.1	310	6.8	1 150	4.4
Charles -----	110	18.9	337	49.6	203	13.5	479	19.2	304	8.6	338	11.6
Dorchester -----	75	1.7	7 390	.4	116	13.2	15 296	.7	274	5.1	1 558	7.0

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Frederick	628	6.5	11 393	10.3	961	3.2	24 027	2.8	845	4.1	2 090	5.6
Garrett	269	10.7	2 032	15.9	425	6.4	4 351	10.2	367	7.5	346	9.2
Harford	237	14.4	974	12.7	400	8.5	3 755	5.6	385	7.3	1 114	9.8
Howard	115	17.5	1 095	9.9	285	5.7	1 396	12.5	111	16.9	654	4.1
Kent	64	21.2	1 290	8.4	112	15.2	8 390	3.1	285	4.4	2 843	3.2
Montgomery	165	15.7	828	10.2	307	7.0	1 805	5.9	234	11.6	1 937	8.3
Prince George's	47	40.2	269	4.2	125	23.1	627	19.3	269	12.3	846	2.8
Queen Anne's	72	13.4	1 889	5	150	13.1	8 695	2.8	347	3.3	2 733	3.9
St. Mary's	150	14.7	1 323	26.9	221	11.6	1 450	17.9	475	5.5	483	8.7
Somerset	198	4.1	21 122	.5	211	5.3	39 418	1.1	198	5.7	784	4.4
Talbot	51	18.4	1 500	3.6	67	12.2	6 675	1.1	199	4.2	1 581	9.2
Washington	316	9.8	3 620	16.0	576	4.4	14 116	5.9	527	4.9	1 271	7.9
Wicomico	399	5.3	31 669	.7	429	5.9	64 429	1.2	409	5.0	1 381	8.9
Worcester	321	6.4	22 834	.4	319	5.6	46 343	.7	285	5.4	1 221	4.1
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	9 078	1.5	59 352	2.2	8 999	1.6	34 930	2.1	12 224	1.1	33 278	1.3
Allegany	140	12.4	238	22.6	156	11.0	114	5.5	193	7.4	240	16.3
Anne Arundel	362	4.8	535	13.1	405	4.1	365	17.4	465	2.2	643	6.0
Baltimore	468	7.7	1 580	5.4	511	6.0	1 178	4.2	773	2.8	1 973	3.4
Calvert	319	5.9	1 128	29.2	349	4.7	463	29.7	357	4.7	495	18.2
Caroline	447	3.9	4 447	11.3	473	3.9	2 850	8.9	540	2.6	2 032	6.1
Carroll	749	3.6	4 177	6.0	757	4.2	2 410	4.1	1 056	1.2	2 591	3.8
Cecil	322	6.2	2 277	9.4	265	8.3	1 291	7.3	418	3.6	962	4.5
Charles	392	4.7	865	5.4	390	5.2	401	8.2	463	2.8	495	7.2
Dorchester	276	4.1	4 069	4.8	295	4.7	2 653	5.4	331	2.7	1 486	5.2
Frederick	1 007	3.1	5 055	4.0	924	3.4	3 003	9.7	1 256	1.9	3 208	3.1
Garrett	453	5.9	961	8.5	328	8.1	272	15.2	600	2.5	892	7.0
Harford	478	6.7	2 108	9.3	398	7.1	1 305	14.8	661	3.0	1 296	7.9
Howard	193	10.3	818	4.2	223	8.7	450	5.0	359	3.3	979	3.2
Kent	283	4.5	5 805	5.3	258	6.5	2 835	6.4	310	2.8	2 136	2.9
Montgomery	346	8.0	2 211	6.7	270	9.5	1 129	2.8	481	4.3	1 238	6.6
Prince George's	420	6.6	887	8.1	380	7.6	590	6.3	520	4.0	814	8.4
Queen Anne's	341	4.4	6 675	5.8	342	4.2	3 465	4.0	398	1.9	2 187	3.7
St. Mary's	560	3.7	1 733	18.5	564	4.1	788	13.5	659	1.9	758	6.6
Somerset	144	7.5	1 172	4.6	204	5.5	1 145	8.0	316	1.5	1 796	3.9
Talbot	212	4.6	3 975	10.0	238	1.0	2 443	11.6	245	1.0	1 505	8.9
Washington	550	5.0	2 888	12.5	575	5.6	1 479	6.5	760	2.6	1 536	4.4
Wicomico	376	6.0	2 923	14.6	412	5.4	2 422	9.9	627	2.4	2 192	4.9
Worcester	240	8.3	2 822	7.6	282	6.2	1 879	5.1	436	1.4	1 825	5.3
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	9 068	1.6	18 192	1.0	4 875	2.5	93 631	1.2	1 335	5.7	7 688	4.6
Allegany	157	11.9	69	15.0	96	17.7	417	27.1	18	55.6	47	14.8
Anne Arundel	289	8.9	264	17.5	161	15.5	917	6.1	24	50.4	114	14.9
Baltimore	568	6.3	744	4.0	303	10.7	8 659	2.5	89	24.4	808	28.5
Calvert	236	8.6	93	17.3	190	10.9	1 170	25.4	27	42.7	46	44.1
Caroline	462	4.2	1 034	3.4	205	9.8	3 906	7.4	53	21.1	599	5.0
Carroll	820	3.4	1 130	5.0	323	9.2	6 728	4.3	101	18.7	485	4.6
Cecil	290	7.9	840	3.0	182	11.4	3 656	2.0	67	27.1	632	3.9
Charles	305	8.7	157	27.8	207	10.7	625	8.2	26	46.8	74	46.6
Dorchester	231	8.0	719	2.5	142	12.8	3 357	12.1	46	31.5	505	32.4
Frederick	1 003	3.4	2 054	3.7	548	6.8	11 081	3.9	149	19.3	428	23.9
Garrett	482	5.6	519	5.4	192	13.3	884	12.0	44	28.0	118	52.4
Harford	420	7.8	540	7.6	252	11.1	3 804	8.9	77	29.5	134	8.3
Howard	275	6.9	378	2.6	160	12.0	3 784	1.1	34	37.3	685	4.1
Kent	250	5.6	963	3.6	115	14.2	9 519	2.4	42	29.1	100	11.4
Montgomery	363	7.8	450	4.2	222	13.2	5 591	4.3	72	22.2	258	9.8
Prince George's	279	10.9	227	6.9	142	16.3	4 457	.8	65	32.0	228	10.5
Queen Anne's	310	5.3	602	4.8	180	11.0	4 376	3.5	17	28.3	255	.9
St. Mary's	363	6.9	182	8.0	239	10.9	1 155	26.4	56	24.0	410	32.4
Somerset	257	5.0	985	1.3	135	7.6	2 824	1.3	66	6.9	685	.6

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-15

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_958 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 3/21/94 10:03 AM MACHINE: EPCV20 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_52,TIPS;1 * 3/16/94 10:20:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 9
TSF:TIPS92-10201396.DAT;1 3/16/94 10:20:21 UTF:TIPS93-10201396.DAT;1 3/16/94 10:20:22 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_52.DAT;2 3/16/94 10:21:04

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Talbot	176	12.6	397	6.3	104	14.6	2 543	16.5	21	38.7	65	7.5
Washington	628	4.6	1 133	5.2	348	7.9	3 456	7.0	104	22.3	250	22.5
Wicomico	536	3.8	2 055	2.9	253	8.3	6 681	2.0	64	10.8	636	6.2
Worcester	368	6.0	2 658	1.3	176	5.4	4 041	.2	73	20.2	127	9.5
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	11 052	1.3	55 156	1.7	4 733	2.7	13 471	4.3	4 602	2.6	42 938	2.0
Allegany	171	10.7	307	19.4	50	33.6	68	11.9	39	37.6	221	16.7
Anne Arundel	404	4.5	649	7.0	113	20.1	97	29.6	122	19.6	429	17.0
Baltimore	729	3.4	3 049	4.9	143	18.7	574	12.0	188	14.5	1 586	12.3
Calvert	343	5.1	805	27.7	134	15.1	137	35.1	124	14.7	426	21.1
Caroline	527	2.8	3 082	5.2	298	7.9	910	13.1	326	6.1	3 702	6.9
Carroll	967	2.3	3 822	5.0	377	8.2	879	15.2	343	9.4	3 278	7.2
Cecil	404	4.5	2 055	3.4	196	13.0	528	17.5	139	13.6	1 582	5.3
Charles	425	4.5	749	11.5	149	16.3	147	23.7	95	24.0	319	30.1
Dorchester	299	5.4	2 234	4.3	140	14.8	582	32.7	195	8.5	2 342	3.9
Frederick	1 079	3.3	6 542	3.7	474	8.5	1 802	14.4	485	7.8	5 209	6.8
Garrett	538	4.7	1 582	7.3	288	9.0	261	14.1	193	13.3	918	15.9
Harford	617	3.8	2 640	8.4	284	11.0	517	13.3	175	13.5	1 329	19.6
Howard	302	5.5	990	5.1	62	21.2	160	4.4	93	21.0	714	13.7
Kent	263	4.7	3 317	7.6	138	11.7	967	28.5	134	13.5	2 161	9.1
Montgomery	430	5.5	2 386	8.9	167	16.4	427	13.2	162	15.6	1 285	11.7
Prince George's	458	6.2	1 207	9.2	88	23.1	564	4.3	113	22.4	445	12.4
Queen Anne's	360	3.8	3 134	5.0	186	11.5	840	16.4	195	9.7	3 331	5.5
St. Mary's	534	4.4	1 389	12.7	235	12.1	309	14.7	204	12.3	860	18.5
Somerset	320	3.1	2 137	5.1	204	6.5	554	5.0	216	5.9	2 253	3.0
Talbot	208	4.0	1 929	9.0	107	21.1	727	22.9	169	13.0	1 841	11.9
Washington	656	3.8	3 576	6.0	354	7.9	1 022	13.8	260	11.7	2 231	12.9
Wicomico	592	3.7	4 225	4.5	319	6.9	754	8.0	351	6.3	3 352	4.7
Worcester	426	3.5	3 348	13.4	227	10.0	645	11.4	281	7.3	3 125	4.5
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	3 632	2.9	36 065	2.9	11 734	1.2	20 879	1.8	11 904	1.2	103 737	.9
Allegany	69	24.3	102	25.6	204	5.4	184	15.7	201	6.0	415	30.6
Anne Arundel	125	14.7	282	22.9	403	5.0	633	8.9	444	3.2	1 477	7.1
Baltimore	213	12.3	1 336	6.2	762	3.2	1 589	5.7	774	2.5	4 908	5.4
Calvert	99	19.9	232	39.4	364	4.5	498	9.9	364	4.4	729	14.4
Caroline	201	10.6	2 117	14.8	536	2.8	880	4.5	555	2.3	6 106	1.5
Carroll	371	8.0	2 947	5.9	991	2.1	1 763	5.9	1 006	1.9	6 456	5.0
Cecil	108	14.5	1 155	10.0	421	3.5	954	6.2	409	4.0	3 281	2.9
Charles	132	15.4	331	22.6	450	4.2	603	9.1	446	4.0	671	7.3
Dorchester	128	14.0	2 521	10.8	307	4.9	649	6.7	339	2.7	4 182	2.4
Frederick	380	7.6	3 710	5.4	1 196	2.4	2 395	4.7	1 221	2.1	10 237	3.5
Garrett	128	15.6	384	19.8	584	2.8	459	5.6	549	4.1	1 991	8.6
Harford	179	13.2	1 429	7.9	681	1.9	1 553	9.6	619	3.7	3 486	3.8
Howard	56	26.3	562	2.9	376	1.1	838	6.3	354	3.8	2 315	2.0
Kent	91	14.4	2 480	3.6	281	4.2	855	9.1	303	3.3	4 117	5.1
Montgomery	115	20.0	1 479	4.4	482	4.9	1 148	10.6	507	2.4	2 984	5.7
Prince George's	80	22.7	302	11.3	457	5.5	675	10.5	448	6.6	2 626	1.5
Queen Anne's	156	12.7	3 256	6.7	362	4.0	824	6.8	398	2.1	4 390	5.0
St. Mary's	152	14.2	367	12.3	563	4.5	800	6.9	580	3.2	1 285	9.8
Somerset	112	8.3	1 265	7.4	321	2.8	530	3.5	329	3.0	9 737	.6
Talbot	134	11.4	2 799	23.1	230	4.8	368	7.9	248	1.0	2 976	6.6
Washington	262	8.6	2 711	15.1	693	3.7	1 079	6.2	745	2.8	4 938	7.8
Wicomico	211	10.8	1 550	12.0	639	2.3	975	3.5	626	2.9	13 580	1.5
Worcester	130	14.6	2 747	8.9	431	4.3	626	3.5	439	3.6	10 851	1.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	13 040	1.0	186 174	2.2	11 605	1.1	1 663 907	.7	10 447	1.1	1 397 069	.6
Allegany -----	219	1.3	1 173	61.5	199	1.3	17 763	2.0	177	1.5	8 988	2.1
Anne Arundel -----	478	1.3	1 643	24.0	437	1.3	27 973	2.1	392	1.3	19 513	2.5
Baltimore -----	840	1.3	5 555	13.9	731	1.3	58 567	1.1	580	1.3	43 796	1.1
Calvert -----	400	2.1	2 369	24.8	380	1.6	21 455	3.1	344	1.7	15 721	3.8
Caroline -----	587	1.1	13 741	7.4	526	1.1	106 610	1.0	504	1.1	101 911	1.0
Carroll -----	1 080	.9	8 918	9.4	987	1.0	129 101	.9	887	1.0	104 959	1.0
Cecil -----	454	1.5	3 950	12.1	416	1.3	60 174	1.4	367	1.4	49 585	1.5
Charles -----	496	1.7	1 366	32.5	475	1.8	33 709	2.0	429	1.8	22 184	2.3
Dorchester -----	346	1.1	11 178	7.5	297	1.3	100 255	1.0	285	1.3	94 671	.9
Frederick -----	1 346	1.0	12 609	10.1	1 243	1.0	173 107	.8	1 126	1.0	134 181	.8
Garrett -----	633	1.3	3 443	17.0	581	1.1	55 517	1.5	557	1.1	37 774	1.6
Harford -----	696	1.8	3 134	23.7	616	1.7	70 958	1.1	547	1.7	55 641	1.1
Howard -----	383	1.1	1 704	11.3	322	1.3	34 281	1.5	248	1.5	26 256	1.5
Kent -----	319	1.3	6 288	11.2	305	1.1	113 211	.9	298	1.1	103 939	.9
Montgomery -----	562	1.4	2 066	33.9	473	1.5	62 600	1.2	393	1.6	45 878	1.2
Prince George's -----	550	2.1	6 365	6.0	517	1.9	32 325	1.4	468	1.9	24 211	1.4
Queen Anne's -----	414	.9	10 774	11.6	392	.9	142 316	.8	375	1.0	130 039	.8
St. Mary's -----	674	1.3	3 459	25.5	651	1.4	44 705	1.4	621	1.4	35 543	1.5
Somerset -----	345	1.5	15 040	1.8	257	1.3	40 096	1.3	224	1.4	37 253	1.3
Talbot -----	251	1.0	6 890	14.2	227	1.1	93 646	.9	220	1.1	88 324	.9
Washington -----	809	1.3	14 733	9.7	741	1.1	92 991	1.2	689	1.1	72 406	1.2
Wicomico -----	684	1.1	26 052	1.7	504	1.0	71 616	1.3	433	1.2	67 100	1.3
Worcester -----	474	1.4	23 724	7.2	328	1.3	80 931	.8	283	1.4	77 196	.8
Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
					Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	1 063	1.2	56 913	.8	4 978	1.1	283 167	.8	2 921	1.2	51 676	1.2
Allegany -----	9	10.7	68	19.0	153	1.8	5 147	2.5	130	2.1	2 157	3.2
Anne Arundel -----	47	4.2	376	10.5	103	3.0	3 531	3.7	88	3.3	(D)	(D)
Baltimore -----	115	2.3	1 083	3.2	263	2.0	12 401	1.9	158	2.5	2 551	4.1
Calvert -----	20	6.5	144	1.4	76	4.1	1 609	5.8	66	4.4	(D)	(D)
Caroline -----	118	2.1	14 809	1.4	87	2.7	4 794	2.3	44	4.1	794	3.9
Carroll -----	29	4.1	357	.7	612	1.2	33 700	1.0	340	1.6	5 586	2.2
Cecil -----	16	5.7	711	1.2	194	2.1	11 253	1.7	113	3.0	1 857	3.9
Charles -----	45	4.6	685	5.2	131	3.2	3 064	4.4	117	3.5	1 541	4.4
Dorchester -----	71	2.7	10 718	1.8	31	5.5	979	5.7	23	6.2	(D)	(D)
Frederick -----	48	3.8	821	7.9	871	1.1	73 252	.7	394	1.7	7 086	2.3
Garrett -----	14	7.3	56	17.6	497	1.2	23 443	1.6	293	1.7	4 704	2.4
Harford -----	35	5.2	318	5.7	384	1.9	18 992	1.3	231	2.5	3 871	2.6
Howard -----	27	4.3	894	.5	161	2.1	8 203	1.7	115	2.6	2 019	3.1
Kent -----	20	5.4	4 770	.8	59	3.1	7 249	2.0	19	6.5	420	8.8
Montgomery -----	58	3.3	884	2.2	211	2.3	11 330	2.1	141	2.9	3 717	2.9
Prince George's -----	56	3.6	637	1.7	101	3.5	3 121	3.3	93	3.6	1 529	3.1
Queen Anne's -----	51	3.0	7 821	2.5	76	2.8	6 400	1.8	26	5.1	756	4.4
St. Mary's -----	113	2.8	1 109	3.9	202	2.2	4 596	2.4	123	2.7	1 684	3.0
Somerset -----	23	4.8	1 504	3.2	48	3.8	2 276	7.8	39	4.5	815	11.0
Talbot -----	21	6.2	1 983	9.0	39	4.0	2 367	3.9	23	5.6	500	8.7
Washington -----	33	5.0	241	10.0	572	1.3	41 875	1.2	269	1.8	5 988	2.2
Wicomico -----	74	2.9	4 597	2.4	63	3.6	1 526	3.0	44	4.4	(D)	(D)
Worcester -----	20	4.4	2 327	.8	44	4.5	2 059	5.7	32	5.1	(D)	(D)
Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	1 329	1.1	94 751	.7	910	1.4	145 519	.9	611	1.7	25 291	1.6
Allegany -----	17	5.8	696	5.0	10	9.6	160	11.6	12	7.9	462	11.8
Anne Arundel -----	9	10.1	(D)	(D)	22	6.9	827	9.0	13	9.5	187	13.2
Baltimore -----	37	4.1	2 903	2.1	43	4.7	4 645	11.5	64	4.0	4 272	3.0
Calvert -----	1	32.6	(D)	(D)	20	8.4	229	11.5	10	11.0	179	14.8
Caroline -----	26	4.1	1 902	3.0	25	4.9	7 395	1.5	12	7.6	391	15.2
Carroll -----	153	2.0	10 643	1.3	105	3.0	9 077	3.0	63	3.6	2 320	5.0
Cecil -----	51	3.5	3 788	2.2	23	6.5	2 644	.4	27	6.1	1 729	3.9
Charles -----	20	7.5	88	2.5	52	4.9	4 407	4.7	15	8.7	389	10.0
Dorchester -----	5	13.9	(D)	(D)	11	7.3	15 591	.7	3	16.4	31	22.3

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-17

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Frederick -----	332	1.4	34 981	.8	88	3.2	2 811	9.0	77	3.9	2 625	6.1
Garrett -----	156	2.4	5 873	2.5	37	5.2	1 643	12.9	57	4.0	1 719	4.8
Harford -----	73	2.8	4 988	1.6	31	6.7	1 238	13.5	41	5.8	3 019	3.1
Howard -----	24	4.3	1 429	2.2	22	6.1	1 730	3.5	48	4.2	1 081	7.4
Kent -----	39	3.5	4 120	1.7	17	6.1	8 599	.9	6	10.1	736	5.2
Montgomery -----	36	4.4	2 517	2.2	28	6.7	483	15.8	32	6.2	1 015	8.5
Prince George's -----	6	14.0	238	4.2	28	6.8	2 557	8.5	14	8.8	1 321	6.1
Queen Anne's -----	36	3.7	2 477	2.1	23	5.0	2 155	.8	11	7.2	886	13.9
St. Mary's -----	64	3.7	406	6.1	127	2.6	18 042	3.6	34	5.0	194	7.0
Somerset -----	6	—	234	—	16	6.6	7 222	6.1	2	—	(D)	(D)
Talbot -----	11	6.9	877	4.1	12	7.0	1 834	1.3	9	11.7	521	6.0
Washington -----	223	1.8	15 907	1.5	73	3.3	9 889	3.8	51	4.0	1 897	5.4
Wicomico -----	2	19.3	(D)	(D)	42	4.2	12 208	1.0	9	10.4	225	19.5
Worcester -----	2	—	(D)	(D)	55	3.3	30 133	.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory						Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold					
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	827	1.6	3 828 633	.5	1 109	.8	257 209 663	.3				
Allegany -----	20	6.7	498	8.6	—	—	—	—				
Anne Arundel -----	43	4.6	1 231	5.8	1	40.2	(D)	(D)				
Baltimore -----	52	4.6	9 769	.7	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Calvert -----	22	7.9	688	7.6	—	—	—	—				
Caroline -----	16	7.3	100 024	6.6	152	1.3	35 549 391	.5				
Carroll -----	83	3.1	1 001 034	(L)	4	13.6	140	13.7				
Cecil -----	34	5.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Charles -----	52	5.2	2 187	13.9	—	—	—	—				
Dorchester -----	13	8.8	65 430	11.9	79	1.8	19 672 412	.7				
Frederick -----	101	3.3	257 436	.1	6	12.6	178	14.5				
Garrett -----	42	5.0	2 135	12.3	6	12.1	(D)	(D)				
Harford -----	40	6.1	1 212	5.8	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Howard -----	22	6.4	685	8.3	3	18.0	115	18.9				
Kent -----	12	7.5	(D)	(D)	9	5.5	2 156 824	1.8				
Montgomery -----	31	6.1	1 455	12.0	5	16.7	251	20.1				
Prince George's -----	40	5.6	1 963	8.6	3	14.1	(D)	(D)				
Queen Anne's -----	13	7.5	17 220	22.6	30	1.5	8 599 198	.5				
St. Mary's -----	76	3.5	11 057	7.4	6	11.7	813	20.4				
Somerset -----	11	9.6	38 435	13.2	187	1.3	48 523 355	.5				
Talbot -----	5	15.4	261	19.7	28	2.3	8 014 902	.9				
Washington -----	55	3.8	448 433	(L)	8	11.2	3 953	27.8				
Wicomico -----	36	4.8	512 731	2.9	322	1.0	76 497 668	.4				
Worcester -----	8	9.6	140 555	3.5	258	1.3	57 407 806	.5				
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Wheat for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	4 631	1.1	454 083	.6	52 596 358	.6	2 774	1.1	188 122	.7	10 233 795	.7
Allegany -----	42	4.3	855	4.7	79 506	5.1	12	8.9	159	10.4	7 925	11.3
Anne Arundel -----	121	2.6	5 328	4.0	598 657	4.4	52	4.1	2 127	4.2	97 922	4.8
Baltimore -----	178	2.2	16 437	1.3	1 906 596	1.2	55	3.8	1 903	2.6	92 104	2.7
Calvert -----	96	3.4	3 133	5.8	332 351	6.4	49	4.7	2 597	5.6	119 852	6.4
Caroline -----	243	1.6	23 361	1.3	2 149 595	1.2	265	1.5	22 893	1.3	1 151 016	1.3
Carroll -----	439	1.4	36 630	1.2	4 126 399	1.1	258	1.8	10 258	1.2	533 859	1.1
Cecil -----	191	2.1	18 605	1.9	2 157 181	1.8	115	2.7	6 260	3.1	355 342	2.8
Charles -----	120	3.0	4 437	3.1	434 613	3.3	65	3.8	3 192	3.0	155 077	3.1
Dorchester -----	135	2.1	18 827	1.2	2 706 319	1.2	147	1.8	19 962	1.2	1 166 314	1.2
Frederick -----	477	1.4	26 113	1.0	2 848 729	1.0	346	1.6	14 340	1.4	704 232	1.1
Garrett -----	192	2.1	4 443	2.7	448 086	2.9	14	8.2	77	9.3	4 176	9.8
Harford -----	263	1.9	23 237	1.4	2 788 307	1.3	95	2.8	3 206	2.2	169 269	1.8
Howard -----	72	3.1	10 679	2.3	1 212 210	2.3	39	4.0	2 286	1.8	110 347	2.0
Kent -----	242	1.4	54 771	1.0	6 475 123	1.1	150	1.8	11 933	1.2	746 903	1.3
Montgomery -----	101	2.9	13 812	1.4	1 587 340	1.3	59	3.6	6 259	1.2	339 091	1.1
Prince George's -----	102	3.4	7 532	1.8	666 805	2.2	47	4.2	2 038	5.4	64 760	5.8
Queen Anne's -----	247	1.4	55 831	.8	6 674 503	.8	220	1.5	26 940	1.1	1 623 368	1.1
St. Mary's -----	261	2.0	8 223	1.8	754 520	1.8	149	2.4	4 874	2.8	235 430	2.8
Somerset -----	131	1.9	11 316	1.5	1 497 477	1.4	82	2.8	6 608	2.1	362 859	2.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Wheat for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Talbot -----	144	1.8	31 147	1.1	3 538 294	1.0	128	1.9	18 526	1.4	1 030 317	1.4
Washington -----	401	1.4	21 439	1.3	2 412 086	1.3	224	1.9	6 725	1.9	353 846	2.0
Wicomico -----	217	1.7	19 786	1.4	2 512 963	1.5	146	2.2	9 754	2.6	523 593	2.5
Worcester -----	216	1.7	38 141	.8	4 688 698	.8	57	3.0	5 205	1.4	286 193	1.5
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Barley for grain						Tobacco					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	1 291	1.1	63 024	.8	4 240 170	.8	951	1.6	8 470	1.7	11 794 382	1.7
Allegany -----	6	12.4	97	2.1	5 765	1.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Anne Arundel -----	3	19.6	153	14.5	13 468	12.3	131	2.6	1 119	2.7	1 494 642	2.8
Baltimore -----	45	3.9	1 894	2.0	127 153	1.8	1	33.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Calvert -----	9	10.7	469	14.4	28 086	14.7	190	2.3	1 766	3.1	2 321 608	3.7
Caroline -----	143	2.0	11 498	1.8	753 247	1.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Carroll -----	184	2.0	6 206	1.4	439 137	1.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cecil -----	47	3.7	2 566	3.8	163 287	4.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Charles -----	4	17.1	149	18.3	10 570	18.1	184	2.4	1 879	2.6	2 552 756	2.6
Dorchester -----	75	2.6	9 622	1.6	647 658	1.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Frederick -----	182	1.9	6 167	1.3	413 947	1.3	2	22.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Garrett -----	37	4.8	624	4.5	42 229	4.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Harford -----	54	3.2	1 733	1.7	102 276	1.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Howard -----	24	4.9	1 153	3.3	87 682	3.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kent -----	39	3.2	2 227	1.8	171 079	1.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montgomery -----	25	4.8	1 165	4.4	75 566	5.4	1	49.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Prince George's -----	3	—	137	—	7 118	—	146	2.9	1 046	2.9	1 410 427	2.7
Queen Anne's -----	68	2.7	4 847	1.9	341 331	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Mary's -----	52	3.8	1 831	3.8	111 264	3.7	296	1.9	2 654	2.4	4 008 337	2.5
Somerset -----	24	5.5	938	5.5	70 831	5.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Talbot -----	39	3.7	2 476	3.8	187 698	3.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington -----	193	2.0	5 390	1.7	322 299	1.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wicomico -----	24	4.3	943	3.3	60 033	3.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worcester -----	11	7.0	739	2.7	58 446	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Soybeans for beans						Hay —alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	3 663	1.1	503 181	.6	16 226 822	.6	5 532	1.1	222 184	1.0	545 526	.9
Allegany -----	1	36.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	160	1.7	7 052	2.3	14 298	2.4
Anne Arundel -----	96	3.1	5 156	4.2	149 969	4.2	153	2.4	4 917	3.4	9 259	4.4
Baltimore -----	84	2.9	9 028	1.4	298 905	1.3	309	1.8	9 637	1.9	24 127	2.2
Calvert -----	87	3.5	6 975	4.7	199 151	4.9	90	3.8	2 052	6.8	3 154	6.8
Caroline -----	378	1.3	61 211	1.1	1 617 861	1.2	110	2.6	3 169	2.6	8 304	2.9
Carroll -----	215	1.8	20 374	1.3	679 339	1.3	710	1.1	26 270	1.5	64 869	1.6
Cecil -----	146	2.4	14 436	2.1	468 099	2.1	241	1.9	8 296	1.7	22 165	1.8
Charles -----	119	3.2	10 298	3.1	319 387	3.4	168	2.9	3 652	4.2	7 072	4.3
Dorchester -----	230	1.4	62 006	1.0	2 079 873	1.1	34	5.3	808	7.4	1 954	8.4
Frederick -----	182	1.9	21 058	1.4	759 222	1.6	938	1.1	50 378	1.1	135 894	1.1
Garrett -----	4	16.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	516	1.2	26 618	1.7	53 314	1.9
Harford -----	123	2.4	9 421	1.6	323 797	1.8	425	1.8	15 166	1.6	40 777	1.8
Howard -----	45	3.6	4 533	1.8	163 122	2.1	172	2.0	7 142	2.8	16 068	2.3
Kent -----	237	1.4	35 602	1.0	1 348 128	1.0	75	2.9	3 288	2.3	12 447	1.7
Montgomery -----	60	3.3	11 239	1.7	358 222	1.5	242	2.1	13 010	2.4	29 453	2.6
Prince George's -----	96	3.4	6 266	2.4	200 439	2.8	151	3.1	3 706	3.3	7 037	3.9
Queen Anne's -----	291	1.2	58 897	1.0	2 016 098	1.0	85	2.7	2 911	1.9	8 035	1.9
St. Mary's -----	244	2.0	15 217	2.2	453 993	2.2	229	2.1	4 100	2.6	7 809	2.9
Somerset -----	177	1.8	21 524	1.5	659 747	1.6	48	4.0	1 110	5.3	2 702	8.0
Talbot -----	182	1.4	47 176	1.1	1 640 291	1.1	29	5.1	1 239	7.6	2 723	5.6
Washington -----	142	2.4	6 339	2.1	250 768	2.2	541	1.3	25 845	1.3	69 788	1.4
Wicomico -----	309	1.4	38 292	1.5	1 105 846	1.5	72	3.3	1 110	4.5	2 849	5.0
Worcester -----	215	1.7	38 022	.8	1 131 765	.7	34	5.4	708	10.2	1 428	11.7

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.			
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)			
	Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland -----	1 167	1.4	36 313	.9
Allegany -----	13	8.6	181	14.0
Anne Arundel -----	78	3.5	952	7.1
Baltimore -----	126	2.8	3 136	4.0
Calvert -----	40	5.1	429	5.0
Caroline -----	87	2.6	6 283	1.9
Carroll -----	72	3.6	3 164	1.2
Cecil -----	20	6.3	188	5.9
Charles -----	48	5.3	315	6.4
Dorchester -----	58	3.2	5 837	2.2
Frederick -----	71	3.7	441	5.1
Garrett -----	36	5.3	295	9.6
Harford -----	50	5.1	905	2.3
Howard -----	22	5.8	377	3.6
Kent -----	12	7.0	1 028	1.9
Montgomery -----	51	4.5	1 200	5.5
Prince George's -----	92	3.7	3 269	1.2
Queen Anne's -----	33	4.3	2 484	1.2
St. Mary's -----	61	4.0	296	6.0
Somerset -----	20	5.1	1 089	2.6
Talbot -----	9	9.7	975	2.3
Washington -----	58	3.8	324	7.3
Wicomico -----	96	2.8	2 802	3.0
Worcester -----	14	9.6	346	7.0

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. State Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error: 1992

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list ¹		Percent not on mail list ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farms ----- number ..	13 037	1.1	3 087	16.9	19.1	2.8
Land in farms ----- acres ..	2 223 476	.7	75 307	21.5	3.3	.7
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	170.6	.5	24.4	17.1	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	1 560	1.4	1 055	34.3	40.3	8.4
10 to 49 acres -----	3 979	1.4	1 633	20.4	29.1	4.4
Less than 50 acres -----	5 539	1.3	2 688	18.6	32.7	4.3
50 acres or more -----	7 498	1.1	399	39.3	5.1	1.9
50 to 99 acres -----	2 246	1.3	245	55.2	9.8	4.9
100 to 179 acres -----	2 008	1.4	153	55.5	7.1	3.7
180 acres or more -----	3 244	1.0	1	100.4	(L)	(L)
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	10 447	1.1	2 049	21.3	16.4	3.1
acres ..	1 397 069	.6	21 866	23.8	1.5	.4
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	1 691	1.8	1 811	23.2	51.7	5.8
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	1 474	1.7	367	39.4	20.0	6.3
Less than \$2,500 -----	3 165	1.7	2 178	21.6	40.8	5.2
\$2,500 or more -----	9 872	1.0	909	28.8	8.4	2.2
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	3 340	1.4	342	39.8	9.3	3.3
\$10,000 or more -----	6 532	1.0	567	39.9	8.0	2.9
Market value of agricultural products sold --- \$1,000 --	1 169 331	.4	11 657	32.8	1.0	.3
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	6 590	1.2	1 586	24.2	19.4	4.1
Livestock (02) -----	6 447	1.0	1 120	25.6	14.8	3.3
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	11 129	1.1	2 732	17.7	19.7	3.1
Partnership or corporation -----	1 823	1.2	85	70.5	4.5	3.0
Other -----	85	2.9	—	(X)	—	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	8 080	1.2	2 500	18.5	23.6	3.6
Part owners and tenants -----	4 957	1.1	317	42.5	6.0	2.4
Part owners -----	3 429	1.0	136	57.2	3.8	2.1
Tenants -----	1 528	1.5	181	63.5	10.6	6.1
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	10 124	1.1	2 541	18.6	20.1	3.2
Not on farm operated -----	2 073	1.4	276	44.5	11.8	4.9
Not reported -----	840	1.4	270	55.3	24.3	10.1
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	6 980	1.0	716	41.8	9.3	3.5
Other -----	6 057	1.3	1 719	22.3	22.1	4.0
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	11 500	1.1	2 484	19.6	17.8	3.1
Female -----	1 537	1.5	333	44.1	17.8	6.5
Operators by race:						
White -----	12 736	1.1	2 196	21.0	14.7	2.8
Black and other races -----	301	2.4	239	47.3	44.3	11.6
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	1 327	1.7	625	37.6	32.0	8.3
5 years or more -----	9 624	1.1	1 551	23.7	13.9	2.9
Average years on present farm -----	19.7	1.5	11.0	29.3	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	2 086	1.3	912	29.2	30.4	6.5
Average age of operator -----	53.9	.1	47.8	20.2	(X)	(X)

NOTE: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

¹Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.